

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 16 through 19, 21 through 24 and 26 through 30 under 35 USC102(a) as being anticipated by EP'940. Claims 20 and 25 stand rejected and under 35 USC103(a) as being unpatentable over EP'940. In the response to arguments portion of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges the attempt on the part of the Applicant to claim particles of polymers which are coated as illustrated in Figure 4 of the specification. However, the Examiner maintains her position that this intention is not clearly reflected in the claim language and therefore maintains the previous rejection for essentially the same reasons.

In response thereto, the Applicant has once more amended claim 16 to remove any possible doubt that the coating is disposed on surfaces of individual super absorbing polymer particles. The Applicant has thereby clearly distinguished the coating as claimed from the top sheet of the '940 reference. Since neither that reference nor any of the other references of record suggest coating of individual polymer particles per se, the structure now recited in independent Claim 16 is distinguished from that prior art. The dependent claims of record inherit the limitations of the base claim and are therefore similarly distinguished from the prior art of record for the reasons given. Amendments to the dependent claims have been taken for consistency with the base claim. Review acceptance and passage to issuance is requested as is entry of the amendment, since no new search is required and since the amendment clearly places the Application in a position of allowance.

No new matter has been added in this amendment.

6

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Vincent

Dr. Paul Vincent

Registration number

37,461

July 19, 2007

Date

Dreiss, Fuhlendorf, Steimle & Becker

Patentanwälte

Postfach 10 37 62

D-70032 Stuttgart, Germany

Telephone +49-711-24 89 38-0

Fax +49-711-24 89 38-99